

Rhode Island Department of Education
Office of Student, Community and Academic Supports

School Support System Report and Support Plan

North Providence Public Schools
November 2011

SCHOOL SUPPORT SYSTEM

A Collaborative System of Focused Monitoring

Introduction

The purpose of the School Support System (SSS) is to provide a means of accountability for delivery of programs and services for students with exceptionalities. The School Support System model is designed to promote the involvement of the whole school district, general educators as well as special educators and parents. It is designed to learn if the district meets the regulations and what effects programs and services have on student outcomes. Finally, the SSS develops a school support plan for training and technical assistance.

To accomplish this the SSS includes these components:

- The Orientation Meeting The Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) staff meets with the Local Education Agency (LEA) to plan the site review and identify issues or initiatives that may influence programs or service delivery.
- Data Analysis Meeting The RIDE staff meets to review LEA demographic information on selected reports including: the LEA annual plan, census information, and information collected through record review, staff questionnaires and parent interviews. To ensure that the child is at the center of the study, all analyses begin with the child. Thus, a sample of approximately 30 students with exceptionalities is selected; the records of these students are reviewed; their parents, teachers and related service providers are interviewed, and their classrooms are observed. The result is an in-depth, unified examination of the actual provision of programs and services for students with exceptionalities. The RIDE staff compiles a preliminary summary of their analyses of this data.
- Presentation by the LEA and School Site Review The on-site review begins with a presentation of programs by teachers and staff. The presentation provides the review team with general and specific information on delivery of programs and services to students. Following this presentation, on-site reviews to all schools are made. The team members interview school administrators and teaching staff. Parents and central office staff are also interviewed. The team gathers sufficient information and works with the LEA personnel to generate a report, covering the following:
 - The district's compliance with the state and federal regulations, relative to the education of students with exceptionalities.
 - The quality and effectiveness of programs and services provided by the district.
 - The need for professional development and technical assistance that will enable the LEA to improve programs and services.
- The Support Plan The RIDE team, LEA central office and building administrators meet to review the data and complete a report of results. The group designs a professional development/technical assistance support plan with timelines for implementation. This plan enables the school and district to correct areas of non-compliance and to strengthen promising programs and correct areas of weakness in order to improve services and programs for all students.
- The SSS Report The report summarizes the findings from the various data sources. The format of the report uses four divisions: Indicators, Findings, Documentation, and Support Plan. Indicators describe either performance or compliance. Findings can include a variety of some six categories, from School Improvement to Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment. The documentation section of the report distinguishes the source of the finding. The support plan reflects the response to the described findings. The support plan describes the corrective action required by the district as well as resources and time lines to improve programs and services.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)
2. Evaluation/ Individual Education Plan (IEP)
3. IDEA Transition

***North Providence Public Schools
SCHOOL SUPPORT SYSTEM REVIEW
NOVEMBER 7 – 10, 2011***

TEAM MEMBERS

***Team A* – Sally Arsenault, Ruth Gallucci**

***Team B* – Barrie Grossi**

***Team C* – Jane Keane, Greg Stewart**

***Team D* – Susan Wood, Therese Curran**

1. FREE APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT (FAPE/LRE)					
Indicator		Findings	Documentation	Support Plan	Follow-up Findings
		The RIDE, Office of Student, Community & Academic Supports School Support System process was facilitated to provide a means of accountability for delivery of programs and services to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The following pages reflect the findings of that process.	Data Analysis State Performance Plan		
Result	1	<p>Least Restrictive Environment Data (State Performance Plan Indicator #5)</p> <p>Based on the FY July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010 State Performance Plan information on North Providence Placement Data is as follows:</p> <p>The percentage of students educated 80 to 100% of the time in general education settings is 67.01%. (RI District Average is 70.86%)</p> <p>Percentage of students educated for less than 40% of the time in general education settings is 13.93% (RI District Average is 14.55%)</p> <p>Percentage of students educated in private separate schools, homebound/hospitalized and private residential schools is 5.73% (RI District Average is 5.14%)</p>	Data Analysis State Performance Plan		
Result	2	<p>Statewide Assessment (State Performance Plan Indicator #3)</p> <p>Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The district (North Providence) disability subgroup (that meets the State's minimum "n" size) <u>did</u> meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup. B. The participation rate for children with IEPs was 99% C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards . This was 36.88 % (as measured against the State target of 26%). Note: State has individual grade and content area targets. State target is average target across grades and content areas. District target is average percent of students proficient across content areas. 	Data Analysis State Performance Plan		

Result	3	<p>Instructional Strategies and Supports</p> <p>Instructional strategies and supports varied through the district and were determined on a school-by-school basis. There were some examples of student centered, teacher facilitated differentiated instruction, with rubrics, modeling, cooperative learning, student lead projects and problem solving, and student work along with homework assignments, independent self-selected reading and journal writing. District-wide selected faculty is scheduled to participate in RIDE-sponsored training in the common core curriculum.</p> <p>Instructional Technology</p> <p>Throughout the district, the use of technology to enhance instruction in general and special education is extremely limited. There is no wireless service provided by the district in the elementary schools and very limited hardwire connections (exception: The Centredale library is wireless). Working computers are generally not available in classrooms, and most of the few available computers, including some in special education service provider spaces, are not in working order. Individual principals are taking the initiative to either fundraise or problem-solve individual staff technology needs and to expand availability of instructional technology for students.</p> <p>Most special educators and related service personnel rely on home computers in off-school hours to access technology necessary for using TIENET for recording IEPs, monitoring/graphing student progress, and writing evaluation and other reports.</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation		
Result	4	<p>Response to Intervention (RtI) at the Elementary Level</p> <p>Individual faculty or principals are leading school-based efforts, which are variable among schools. There is no evidence of any recent systematic, district level RtI development, protocols or staff development initiatives.</p> <p>At the elementary level, there are emerging and variable efforts within individual schools to implement RtI practices, with some principals leading a renewed effort this year to reestablish earlier RtI efforts that had waned. Although AIMSweb has been purchased for tracking student progress, and some principals are establishing RtI teams and meeting schedules with referral, intervention, and progress tracking protocols, there is little evidence of research-based interventions systematically in place for supplementary, targeted, or intensive general education interventions. The primary vehicle for staff access to these is left to personal web searches.</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation		

Compliance	5	<p>Response to Intervention (Rtl) at the Middle Level</p> <p>Response to Intervention at the Birchwood Middle School has not been formally established. Continued exploration of the management practices and protocols, roles and responsibilities, intervention and progress monitoring strategies are ongoing.</p> <p>Faculty has not participated in professional development addressing secondary Rtl planning and implementation. Though some teams collected student specific data, (GRADE, NECAP, student work, teacher generated assessments, etc.) to identify modifications and/or accommodations as an instructional intervention strategy, the overall understanding of Rtl as a system of scientific research-based interventions was not clearly understood. RI Regulations 300.307(2)</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation	Rtl at Birchwood Middle School is at the beginning stages of discussion and implementation.																																																																														
Result	6	<p>Response to Intervention (Rtl) at the High School Level</p> <p>At the high school the Rtl team meets every other week after school. Teachers can write a referral to the Rtl team and can attend the Rtl meeting if they choose to. Rtl is in the beginning stages, however, it is part of the Rtl secondary cohort and participants are very excited about this technical assistance. Currently various academic interventions include math clinics and math workshops, writing centers and writing workshops, etc.</p> <p>The high school also has a response team which meets every week. A response team has been established to provide students and families with the interventions and supports necessary to respond to a crisis as well as overall social/emotional challenges.</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation																																																																															
Result	7	<p>SPP Disproportionate Representation (State Performance Plan Indicators #9 and #10)</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>ED</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>OHI</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>White</td><td>2006</td><td>2007</td><td>2008</td><td>2009</td><td>2010</td><td>2006</td><td>2007</td><td>2008</td></tr><tr><td>Students with Disability</td><td>55</td><td>46</td><td>39</td><td>42</td><td>46</td><td>160</td><td>128</td><td>106</td></tr><tr><td>Total Students</td><td>2738</td><td>2645</td><td>2499</td><td>2485</td><td>2398</td><td>2738</td><td>2645</td><td>2499</td></tr><tr><td>District Risk</td><td>2.01</td><td>1.74</td><td>1.56</td><td>1.69</td><td>1.92</td><td>5.84</td><td>4.84</td><td>4.24</td></tr><tr><td>Nat'l Risk</td><td>0.69</td><td>0.72</td><td>0.72</td><td>0.72</td><td>0.63</td><td>0.90</td><td>0.85</td><td>0.85</td></tr><tr><td>District Risk Ratio</td><td>2.91</td><td>2.42</td><td>2.17</td><td>2.35</td><td>3.04</td><td>6.49</td><td>5.69</td><td>4.99</td></tr></table> <table><tr><td></td><td>S&L</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>200</td><td>200</td><td>200</td><td>200</td><td>201</td><td></td></tr></table>		ED						OHI		White	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2006	2007	2008	Students with Disability	55	46	39	42	46	160	128	106	Total Students	2738	2645	2499	2485	2398	2738	2645	2499	District Risk	2.01	1.74	1.56	1.69	1.92	5.84	4.84	4.24	Nat'l Risk	0.69	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.63	0.90	0.85	0.85	District Risk Ratio	2.91	2.42	2.17	2.35	3.04	6.49	5.69	4.99		S&L							200	200	200	200	201		Data Analysis State Performance Plan		
	ED						OHI																																																																											
White	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2006	2007	2008																																																																										
Students with Disability	55	46	39	42	46	160	128	106																																																																										
Total Students	2738	2645	2499	2485	2398	2738	2645	2499																																																																										
District Risk	2.01	1.74	1.56	1.69	1.92	5.84	4.84	4.24																																																																										
Nat'l Risk	0.69	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.63	0.90	0.85	0.85																																																																										
District Risk Ratio	2.91	2.42	2.17	2.35	3.04	6.49	5.69	4.99																																																																										
	S&L																																																																																	
	200	200	200	200	201																																																																													

		<table> <tr> <td></td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Students with Disability</td><td>22</td><td>23</td><td>12</td><td>13</td><td>21</td></tr> <tr> <td>Total Students</td><td>370</td><td>404</td><td>419</td><td>443</td><td>474</td></tr> <tr> <td>District Risk</td><td>5.9 5</td><td>5.6 9</td><td>2.8 6</td><td>2.9 3</td><td>4.43</td></tr> <tr> <td>Nat'l Risk</td><td>1.7 3</td><td>1.7 4</td><td>1.7 4</td><td>1.7 4</td><td>1.70</td></tr> <tr> <td>District Risk Ratio</td><td>3.4 4</td><td>3.2 7</td><td>1.6 5</td><td>1.6 9</td><td>2.61</td></tr> </table> <p>While North Providence continues to have areas of significant disproportionality, both file review and an onsite verification of policies, procedures, and practices as reported in the CRP process demonstrated no areas of inappropriate identification practices nor individual cases of inappropriate identification as causal factors of disproportionate representation. Continued implementation of strategies and social emotional supports both internally and via contracted agencies are encouraged to continue the downward trend in the area of OHI. The areas of ED for students who are White and Speech/Language for students who are Hispanic reflect a recent uptick in the data and should be monitored closely by district leadership to prevent additional areas of disproportionality from developing. Ensuring that students receive appropriate supports in the general education environment through structures such as RtI may help to provide continuous improvement in these areas. While file reviews did find inappropriate identification of students with Learning Disabilities, the data does not reflect disproportionate trends for any race/ethnicity under LD.</p>		6	7	8	9	0	Students with Disability	22	23	12	13	21	Total Students	370	404	419	443	474	District Risk	5.9 5	5.6 9	2.8 6	2.9 3	4.43	Nat'l Risk	1.7 3	1.7 4	1.7 4	1.7 4	1.70	District Risk Ratio	3.4 4	3.2 7	1.6 5	1.6 9	2.61			
	6	7	8	9	0																																				
Students with Disability	22	23	12	13	21																																				
Total Students	370	404	419	443	474																																				
District Risk	5.9 5	5.6 9	2.8 6	2.9 3	4.43																																				
Nat'l Risk	1.7 3	1.7 4	1.7 4	1.7 4	1.70																																				
District Risk Ratio	3.4 4	3.2 7	1.6 5	1.6 9	2.61																																				
Result/ Compliance	8	<p>Early Childhood/Pre School Special Education</p> <p>The district's participation in the mandatory early childhood outcomes project is variable. A few individual staff members are meeting requirements for documentation and assessment. The district as a whole however does not comply with the required processes or timelines. Therapists are currently unaware of their role and responsibility to assist special educators in the assessment process. (RI Regulations 300.226)</p> <p>Currently there is not an administrator responsible for overseeing the assessment process, which includes setting up and monitoring the assessment site, the individual portfolios, entries and exits, the quality and quantity of observations, compliance with state checkpoints and general accuracy of data.</p>	Data Analysis State Performance Plan	The special education director will review roles and responsibilities with appropriate staff to ensure compliance. Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. September 2012 (Progress check in July 2012)																																					

		<p>In this district the percent of preschool children who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings) is at 84% (State Performance Plan Indicator #6)</p> <p>State Performance Plan Indicator #7</p> <p>Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); 57% -Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); 67 % and -Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. 40% <p>Although, some teachers have conscientiously and accurately completed their early childhood assessments, overall consistency of entry and exit protocol, compliance with checkpoint due dates, quantity and quality of observations, as well as administrative oversight has been lacking.</p>			
Result	9	<p>Elementary Level</p> <p>There are 2,890 students at the elementary level and approximately 427 students have IEPs. The special education program continuum is as follows:</p> <p>Program Continuum, Preschool level</p> <p>The district implements the following array of services for preschool children with IEPs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Individual sessions of speech/language therapy only ("walk-in" service) -Six half-day sessions offering integrated classrooms of up to seven children with IEPs and up to eight typically developing peers, located between two elementary schools. -Two half-day sessions providing a special education class for students with IEPs only, referred to as a "self-contained" class. <p>All preschool programs are located at Greystone Elementary School, with the exception of two half-day sessions at Centredale Elementary School.</p> <p>Program Continuum, Elementary Level</p> <p>At the elementary level, the program continuum consists of special education "resource" services which vary greatly among schools. Most provide specialized instruction for students with IEPs primarily in inclusive settings, through co-teaching or through in-class special education services. Greystone Elementary school delivers services primarily in a separate setting using a "pull-out" approach as a function of caseload and scheduling.</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation		

Compliance		<p>Few special education classes in self-contained settings are currently operating at the elementary level. Whelan has a class for students with intellectual disabilities who are served in a self-contained setting. Faculty report a dilemma in implementing IEPs for students who move into the district with an IEP delineating “self-contained” services. In some cases, the IEP is reconsidered, with services provided by a special educator within general education; in some cases, students receive such services in non-public special education programs outside of the district.</p> <p>Among elementary schools, a disparity was noted in the level of service delivery available to students with IEPs at Greystone Elementary School. The match between student service needs indicated on IEPs and the assignment to a single special educator (referred to as “resource teacher”) for grades K through 5, brings service hours to a number exceeding the number of hours in a school day. This results in the following concerns: With the exception of one in-class service delivery (5th grade math instruction), all services are provided in a separate setting based on administrative necessity rather than LRE considerations; students are grouped in larger, multi-level groupings (up to 8) reflecting a wide and diverse collection of student needs. Hence, given the nature of students’ IEPs and the service schedule, in-class service delivery and co-teaching are precluded. In addition, students’ services are missed when the teacher attends meetings each week. (RI Regulations 300.101)</p>		<p>Professional development/technical assistance in the areas of IEP development /writing with regard to program continuum will be provided. In addition, the special education director in conjunction with school based administrators will review and reassess the need for continued professional development / technical assistance as well program continuum development issues on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. December 2012 (Progress check July 2012).</p>	
Result		<p>Marieville is a school with a poverty index qualifying it as eligible to be a Title I school wide program. To date, the district has not pursued school wide status, and Marieville is designated as a Targeted Assistance school. Title I reading services are available to eligible students with or without and IEPs, as appropriate.</p>			

Result	10	<p>Program Continuum Middle Level</p> <p>There are 398 students attending Birchwood Middle School and approximately 47 are students have IEPs.. Following a middle school model, Birchwood Middle School facilitates its educational program with grade level teams at each grade level along with a split 7th/8th grade team.</p> <p>The special education program continuum is as follows:</p> <p>Specialized instruction is provided through emerging inclusionary practices with special educators (two resource teachers across grade level) providing support in the general education setting as appropriate. Some co-teaching was evident, however limited in practice and is determined by educator relationship and schedule. Students may be pulled from their general education settings to receive specific instruction and/or resource services and supports as directed by their IEPs. Additional support is provided in ELA, writing and math as determined by NECAP assessment outcomes and teacher recommendations, along with student work.</p> <p>Birchwood Middle School has established three self-contained settings for students needing more intensive instructional opportunities. They are as follows:</p> <p>-A specialized self-contained functional life skills setting is provided for (5) students with significant intellectual challenges, needing individualized direct instruction. Currently this program has limited naturally occurring peer interaction (lunch only) and no opportunities for the development or exploration of daily living and/or life skills. Though there is a small sink and microwave oven within this classroom, these features have not been incorporated into the curriculum. Opportunities to explore whole school community experiences have not been developed to support vocational exploration supporting functional skills as appropriate in the design and implementation of instructional supports and strategies within this classroom. Students who participate in this classroom setting are all eligible for alternate assessment.</p> <p>Students participating in this specialized setting were displaced to the cafeteria, library and tech room throughout the NECAP testing schedule due to being (identified) viewed as disruptive to the testing process. Related services and supports for students within this program are often provided outside of the classroom setting. Due to space limitation and scheduling conflicts, a consistent setting for related service delivery has not been identified (occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech). Due to the number of students with significant disabilities that are challenged by change in routine, continuity is imperative to the success of learning. (RI Regulations 300.101)</p>	<p>Data Analysis Interviews Observation</p>	<p>Professional development/technical assistance in the areas of IEP development /writing with regard to program continuum will be provided. In addition, the special education director in conjunction with school based administrators will review and reassess the need for continued professional development / technical assistance as well program continuum development issues on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. December 2012 (Progress check July 2012).</p> <p>The special education director in conjunction with school based administrators will review and refine the specialized self-contained functional life skills class to expand typical peer interaction general school belonging. In addition, technical assistance will be provided with regard to alternate assessment and vocational</p>	
--------	----	--	---	--	--

		<p>Alternate Assessment eligibility (checklist) policy and practice are unclear. In addition, students who are/or who will be 14 years of age are not provided a means to address vocational interest prohibiting pertinent information to inform the IEP (JK1, 5).</p> <p>Two specialized self-contained settings are provided for students with significant learning and/or behavior challenges (one for 6th graders and one for 7th/8th grade students). The self-contained setting is a home base for intensive support and instruction as directed by students' IEPs. Students may receive ELA, writing and/or math with the special educator (teacher of record). Special educators may co-teach as the schedule allows. Determination of placement in intensive content area classes is based on teacher recommendations, the NECAP and teacher generated assessment. Students may move in/out of this level of support based on progress.</p>		<p>assessment issues/ concerns.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. September 2012 (Progress check July 2012).</p>	
Result	11	<p>At North Providence High School there are approximately 1,100 students and 168 have IEPs. The program continuum is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Co-taught classes (9th-12th.)- Specific classes are chosen over the summer depending on the overall student need. There are 17 co-taught classes that cover a myriad of grades and subject areas. -There are also academic classes taught in self-contained settings by special educators (math, science, ELA, and social studies). Not all of these special educators are highly qualified under NCLB. Title IIa is in the process of facilitating a review with regard to certification/highly qualified. -Academic Support/Resource- Students typically access resource either three or five days out of the seven day rotation. Students receive either a half or full credit for this class. -Transition Program, Students with social/ emotional needs. These students, depending on need, may receive their academic work within the class setting or participate in the general education classes with their typical peers. -Work Study Program. This program targets juniors and seniors (predominately these are students with IEPs). These students receive their academic classes within this setting (social studies, math, ELA and career) and go to another special educator for science. They are in school until 11:30 am and then go to a work study environment in the community. This is monitored and managed by the teacher. Some of these experiences are paid internships, which often results in summer employment. 	<p>Data Analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Observation</p>		

		<p>-Life Skills. One class for students with significant intellectual disabilities. Students may take classes within the Life Skill setting or in other academic content areas in self-contained settings with special educators. In addition to the academic program, students participate in community-based experiences and job experiences. Student's access public transportation for the majority of these experiences. Students (18-21 years of age) in the Life Skills program typically have contracted experiences with individualized service providers (Goodwill, Perspectives, etc). The Life Skills teacher is the case manager for these students as well.</p> <p>There is a full-time psychologist and social worker at the high school and a student assistance counselor. North Providence High School has a variety of drop-out prevention and social/emotional programs run by the school social worker. These include the multicultural group, which explores diversity issues, Asperger group for males, and the Social Skills Groups in the Life Skills classes. There is also a peer mentoring program. This pairs students with intellectual disabilities with typical peers who may be interested in a career in the education field. In addition, individual students receive counseling services on an as needed basis or as determined by their IEP by social worker and psychologist.</p> <p>At the high school, the Temporary Learning Center (TLC) is an in-school suspension program that is staffed by a special education teacher and hosts no more than 12 students (special education and general education students) at a time. There are two seats set aside from the 12 for in-school suspension that are designated as Alternate Learning Program (ALE). Special education teachers can send students to this for a period on an as needed basis. A certified special education teacher staffs the TLC and the ALE.</p>			
Result	12	Adaptive Physical Education is provided as directed by students' IEPs. Services are provided in an appropriate setting with a confidential space to facilitate evaluations.	Data Analysis Interviews Observation		
Result/ Compliance	13	Throughout the district the practice has been to notify the schools in March or April to identify students requiring extended school year (ESY) services. Some special educators indicate they make this assessment themselves by reviewing student needs, identifying potential candidates, collecting regression data during April vacation, then contacting parents to inform them of summer programming. Some parents have declined ESY due to a lack of transportation or conflicts with vacation schedules. (RI Regulations 300.106)	Data Analysis Interviews	The special education director will review and address the ESY cited issues/concerns. Technical assistance will be provided with regard to ESY processes, procedures and protocols.	

				Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. December 2012 (Progress check October 2012).	
Result	14	<p>Suspension (State Performance Plan Indicator #4): Significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions (for students with IEPs) greater than 10 days as compared to the rate of suspensions (for students without IEPs) greater than 10 days.</p> <p>North Providence had less than 0 students with IEPs suspended more than 10 days (2009-2010). The total of all students suspended more than 10 days was less than 10. There is no significant discrepancy.</p> <p>School Removals/Disciplinary Policies Throughout the district behavioral expectations along with disciplinary action protocols and policies are comprehensively defined in a student handbook.</p>	Data Analysis State Performance Plan Interviews Observation		
Result	15	<p>School Efforts to Partner with Parents (State Performance Plan Indicator #8)</p> <p>The district's rate of parent participation in the annual Special Education Statewide Parent Survey (2010-2011) is 11% of parents whose children have IEPs.</p> <p>Of parents with a child receiving special education services who participated in the last survey, the percent that reported that their school's efforts to involve parents, as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, are at or above the state standard is 32%.</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation		
Result	16	<p>Local Special Education Advisory Committee (LAC)</p> <p>A local advisory committee with membership, operation, and scheduled meetings, consistent with the RI Board of Regents Regulations Governing the Education of Children with Disabilities, is active and supported by the district.</p> <p>The North Providence LAC has a chair and core group, but considers every parent of a student with disabilities to be a member. The special education director has been a consistent meeting participant. The committee meets four times per year, offering special topics at meetings and experiencing good attendance from a wider group of parents.</p> <p>The LAC played an active role last spring in selecting the new special education director,</p>	Data Analysis State Performance Plan		

		<p>with two LAC members participating in the interview process.</p> <p>The LAC has successfully generated by-laws as well as a September 2011 strategic plan for 2011-2014. Its mission is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve communication among parents, staff, administrators, schools and the school committee on special education needs through the promotion of a team concept; • Advocate for partnership with parents of students with disabilities to ensure that they receive the entitlements provided to them under state and federal laws; • Inform the community of North Providence through the North Providence School Committee about the current special education services, meeting needs, future plans, state and federal funding applications and the evaluation and monitoring of outcomes of special education programs; and • Encourage a greater understanding, acceptance, compassion, and inclusion of children with special needs. <p>LAC goals for 2011-2014 are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Improve and expand all communications 2) Promote consumer advocacy in special education 3) Serve as a resource to the community <p>To achieve its goals, the committee projects five objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Expand strategic alliances b) Expand access to special educational services c) Expand consumer awareness of NPSELAC advocacy d) Increase attendance to meetings annually by 5% e) Increase the personal and professional growth of the participants of the NPSELAC <p>The LAC's goals and objectives are supported by delineated strategies and action plans.</p> <p>Many special educators within the schools visited were unfamiliar with the LAC. A few staff members knew about the meetings, but reported that they had minimal participation. The schools indicate that they do not inform parents of the organization but thought that the notification may take place through district level administration.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

2. EVALUATION/ INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP)					
Indicator		Findings	Documentation	Support Plan	Follow-up Findings
Result/ Compliance	1	<p>Records of approximately 17 students were reviewed prior to the on-site review by the team leaders. Students' records were very accessible. The record review process identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No documentation of interventions, support, and/or educational progress, progress monitoring, and/or other considerations in determining eligibility. There is very limited evidence that Specific Learning Disability determination is conducted consistent with (in relationship to) the State Criteria aligned with the RtI process. - Confidential student files do not contain logs of access - Various documents were missing from files (evaluations, invitations, consents) - Regulatory time frames not consistently adhered to - Team Meeting Form 8C & Team Summary Form 10 show reevaluation as a function of "Eligibility Determination" but not a function of "IEP Development". On such forms, a third category is "Placement", also not indicated as an IEP team function - Parent Notice Form 8B erroneously separates purposes such as "IEP Meeting" from purposes of discussing re-evaluations and of determining continued eligibility for students already identified - IEP annual goals, short team objectives and benchmarks are not written in a measurable manner <p>(RI Regulations Subpart D Evaluations, Eligibility Determinations, Individualized Education Programs and Educational Placements)</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation	<p>Assurances will be provided to the Rhode Island Department of Education, Office of Student, Community and Academic Supports, that compliance issues are addressed and rectified. This Support Plan is applicable for all compliance findings in this section.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. December 2012 (Progress check October 2012).</p>	
Result/ Compliance	2	<p>Child Outreach Screening</p> <p>North Providence's child outreach screenings are available in a range of community-based early childhood programs and by appointment September through June.</p> <p>All screening instruments are reliable, valid measures as delineated in "Best Practices Guidelines for Child Outreach Screening Programs in Rhode Island"</p> <p>The state target for screening is 80% of children ages 3, 4, and 5. In North Providence's most recent Consolidated Resource Plan, the district reports the following screening percentages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 year olds: 41% 	State Performance Plan data Interviews	<p>The special education director will review roles and responsibilities with appropriate staff to ensure compliance.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. September 2012 (Progress check in July 2012)</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 year olds: 65% • 5 year olds: 51% <p>The district has not yet developed an effective strategy for reaching 3, 4 & 5 year old residents not enrolled in center-based programs or living in high poverty areas of the city. (RI Regulations 300.111)</p>			
Compliance	3	<p>Child Find (State Performance Plan Indicator #11)</p> <p>North Providence for the 2010-2011 year was at 90.20% compliance for meeting evaluation timelines for initial referrals. As of 11/ 21/11 North Providence was thus far at 91.67% compliance for meeting evaluation timelines for initial referrals for the 2011-2012 school year. (RI Regulations 300.111).</p>	State Performance Plan data	The special education director will review roles and responsibilities with appropriate staff to ensure compliance. Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. September 2012 (Progress check in July 2012)	
Compliance	4	<p>Specific Learning Disabilities Determination Process</p> <p>Throughout the district special educators were unclear of the requirements to base student eligibility on systematic RtI progress data, and how to implement this. In the absence of a well developed, general education RtI system across the district, special education evaluation teams lack necessary data, protocols and practices to implement this process as part of special education evaluation. Evaluations currently perpetuate reliance on educational and psychological assessments as the basis for determination of specific learning disability.</p> <p>North Providence has a waiver for use of RTI data in determining specific learning disabilities at the secondary level for the 2011-2012 school year. (RI Regulations 300.307(2))</p>	Record Reviews Interviews	<p>Professional development/technical assistance in the area of the specific learning disabilities determination process will occur. In addition, the special education director will review and reassess the need for continued professional development / technical assistance in this area on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. December 2012 (Progress check July 2012).</p>	
Compliance	5	<p>IEP Team/Re-Evaluation</p> <p>At the elementary level and at Birchwood Middle School, there is limited evidence that</p>	Record Reviews Interviews	Professional development/technical assistance in the cited. In	

		re-evaluation decisions are driven by the IEP process as required. Special educators generally track re-evaluation due dates, the school psychologist or other team member sends home a form for consent, and a psychological and educational assessment, along with additional assessments as applicable, are customarily conducted. This occurs as a process distinct from the required IEP meeting, where needed evaluations would be determined based on the IEP team's questions, and concluded evaluations would be reviewed and acted upon by the IEP team. (RI Regulations 300.303)		addition, the special education director will review and reassess the need for continued professional development / technical assistance in this area on an ongoing basis. Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. December 2012 (Progress check July 2012).	
Result	6	IEP implementation/specialized instruction At the elementary level, there is limited evidence that staff is aware of or equipped with research-based specialized instructional methodology. Staff report lack of district initiatives to promote staff development in this arena or to acquire and promote specialized instructional materials to supplement the standards-based curriculum for students with disabilities. Some former special educators with training in specialized reading methods had expertise but have since left the district. Most special education teachers use self-created materials.	Interviews	The special education director in conjunction with school-based administrators will review and reassess the need for continued professional development / technical assistance in this area on an ongoing basis. Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. December 2012 (Progress check July 2012).	
Result/ Compliance	7	Accommodations provided within general education Throughout the district general educators are made aware of accommodations indicated on their students' IEPs through either review of their IEPs with the special educator, as an embedded part of co-teaching or via an accommodation sheet that lists the students' needed accommodations. This process, however, is inconsistent among elementary schools. Also at the elementary level, awareness of IEP accommodations among music, art, health, and physical educators was not evident and IEPs are not typically reviewed with them. (RI Regulations 300.321)	Data Analysis Interviews	Professional development/technical assistance in the cited area will occur. In addition, the special education director will review and reassess the need for continued professional development / technical	

				<p>assistance in this area on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. December 2012 (Progress check July 2012).</p>	
Compliance	8	<p>Specific Student Compliance Issues</p> <p>Preschool Level Preschool students' placements are decided by a central district evaluation team upon determination of eligibility, prior to the IEP meeting. The evaluation team notifies parents of what services the child is eligible to receive and assigns the students to a specific class and teacher. After the students are placed, the classroom teacher convenes a meeting to develop the IEP. (RI Regulations 300.115 (b)).</p> <p>The district's central preschool team making placement decisions does not include a general preschool teacher or early childhood special educator. The team has not received district level policies, procedures, or protocols guiding appropriate practice or requirements regarding the process and participants. (RI Regulations 300.115 (b)).</p> <p>Preschool students' IEPs for the special education classroom do not accurately reflect their placement. Actual placement is full-time in the special education class, but described in the IEP as general early childhood setting supplemented by placement in early childhood special education. (RI Regulations 300.115 (b)).</p> <p>Extent of preschool students' non-participation in regular class is not sufficiently explained by the boilerplate statement written in all IEPs reviewed, nor substantiated through observation or interview (RI Regulation 300.320).</p> <p>Preschool IEPs for children in the district's special education preschool class have been developed inconsistent with RIDE guidance and regulation in that the special education services listed on each totals up to 32 hours per day, for 5 days per week. This appears to be a training issue (RI Regulation 300.320).</p> <p>Of 11 students placed in the district's single preschool special education classroom, there are only three complete IEPs kept on school premises. Of these, two are up to date. The three IEPs are filed in the classroom (RI Regulation 300.320).</p>	<p>Interviews Observation Record Review</p> <p>RG1,2,3</p> <p>RG1,2,3</p> <p>RG1,2,3</p> <p>RG1,2,3</p> <p>RG1,2,3</p> <p>RG1,2,3</p>	<p>The special education director will review roles and responsibilities with appropriate staff to ensure compliance (Note, each cited case will be reviewed and reconvened as appropriate to ensure current compliance). Professional development/technical assistance in the cited area will occur.. In addition, the special education director will review and reassess the need for continued professional development / technical assistance in this area on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. December 2012 (Progress check July 2012).</p>	

		<p>Elementary Level A group of 5th grade students whose IEPs delineated specialized (“resource”) instruction did not receive this service consistent with their IEPs in the 2010-2011 school year, when their services were assigned to a special educator from another school who did not consistently come to Greystone School to deliver the service. (RI Regulations 300.320).</p> <p>Six students’ specialized instruction indicated in their IEPs is frequently cancelled this year at Greystone when their special education teacher must attend meetings, and the caseload configuration is too tight to reschedule their instruction (RI Regulations 300.320).</p> <p>The IEP was altered for one student who enrolled in the district with an IEP indicating services in a special education classroom, because only a special education “resource” model was available. The student receives resource services (RI Regulations 300.320).</p> <p>Three students did no/have not received assistive technology devices or adaptive equipment as required by evaluation and IEP and known to the district last spring. School opened this year without receipt until late September/early October, and one student still does not have an adaptive chair (RI Regulations 300.105).</p> <p>Services indicated on two students’ IEPs were designated based on availability of service rather than student need. They are currently receiving less service due to caseload assignment issues (RI Regulations 300.320).</p> <p>Technology that is required in a student’s IEP is not available for the student, including a Slant board, special chair and desk, sensory diet materials, and picture schedule (RI Regulations 300.105).</p> <p>Services delineated in (the) one student’s IEP are not the same as those services delivered at the school (RI Regulations 300.320).</p> <p>Middle Level A self-contained setting at Birchwood Middle School (rm. 9) is limited in space and has only 1 door (egress) located at the end of a hallway. Students receive identified instruction within this setting (RI Regulations 300.114).</p>	<p>RG4,5,6,7,8</p> <p>Teacher report</p> <p>SA10</p> <p>SA8,9,11</p> <p>SA12,13</p> <p>BG1,7</p> <p>BG4</p>	<p>The special education director will review roles and responsibilities with appropriate staff to ensure compliance (Note, each cited case will be reviewed and reconvened as appropriate to ensure current compliance). Professional development/technical assistance in the cited. In addition, the special education director will review and reassess the need for continued professional development / technical assistance in this area on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. December 2012 (Progress check July 2012).</p>	<p>As of 12/15/11 an order was placed for this equipment.</p>
Result	9	<p>Due Process Summary (State Performance Indicators #16,#17,#18,and #19) During the SSS data analysis due process information is reviewed for the past three</p>	State Performance Plan	Compliance items cited in the due process	

	<p>years. A summary is provided here.</p> <p><u>COMPLAINTS</u></p> <p><u>2009</u></p> <p><u># of Complaint:</u></p> <table><tr><td></td><td><i>ISSUE(S)</i></td><td><i>RESULT</i></td></tr><tr><td>Complaint #1</td><td>IEP</td><td>Finding of Noncompliance</td></tr></table> <p><u>2010</u></p> <p><u># of Complaints:</u></p> <table><tr><td></td><td><i>ISSUE(S)</i></td><td><i>RESULT</i></td></tr><tr><td>Complaint #1</td><td>IEP</td><td>Part Compliant & Non-Compliant</td></tr></table> <p><u>2011</u></p> <p><u># of Mediations:</u></p> <table><tr><td></td><td><i>ISSUE(S)</i></td><td><i>RESULT</i></td></tr><tr><td>Complaint #1</td><td>IEP</td><td>Finding of Noncompliance</td></tr></table> <p><u>MEDIATIONS</u></p> <p><u>2009</u></p> <p><u># of Mediations:</u> No mediations during this period</p> <p><u>2010</u></p> <p><u># of Mediations:</u></p> <table><tr><td></td><td><i>ISSUE(S)</i></td><td><i>RESULT</i></td></tr><tr><td>Mediation #1</td><td>Other/Eligibility</td><td>Agreement Reached</td></tr><tr><td>Mediation #2</td><td>Other/1:1 Assistant</td><td>Agreement Reached</td></tr><tr><td>Mediation #3</td><td>Placement</td><td>Withdrawn</td></tr></table> <p><u>2011</u></p> <p><u># of Mediations:</u> No mediations during this period</p> <p><u>HEARINGS</u></p> <p><u>2009</u></p> <p><u># of Hearings:</u></p> <table><tr><td></td><td><i>ISSUE(S)</i></td><td><i>FINDING(S)</i></td></tr><tr><td>Hearing #1</td><td>Placement</td><td>Withdrawn</td></tr></table> <p><u>2010</u></p> <p><u># of Hearings:</u> No hearings during this period</p>		<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>RESULT</i>	Complaint #1	IEP	Finding of Noncompliance		<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>RESULT</i>	Complaint #1	IEP	Part Compliant & Non-Compliant		<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>RESULT</i>	Complaint #1	IEP	Finding of Noncompliance		<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>RESULT</i>	Mediation #1	Other/Eligibility	Agreement Reached	Mediation #2	Other/1:1 Assistant	Agreement Reached	Mediation #3	Placement	Withdrawn		<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>FINDING(S)</i>	Hearing #1	Placement	Withdrawn	Due process Data Data analysis	findings were verified as corrected or remedied by RIDE due process personnel.	
	<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>RESULT</i>																																						
Complaint #1	IEP	Finding of Noncompliance																																						
	<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>RESULT</i>																																						
Complaint #1	IEP	Part Compliant & Non-Compliant																																						
	<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>RESULT</i>																																						
Complaint #1	IEP	Finding of Noncompliance																																						
	<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>RESULT</i>																																						
Mediation #1	Other/Eligibility	Agreement Reached																																						
Mediation #2	Other/1:1 Assistant	Agreement Reached																																						
Mediation #3	Placement	Withdrawn																																						
	<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>FINDING(S)</i>																																						
Hearing #1	Placement	Withdrawn																																						

		<u>2011</u> <u># of Hearings:</u> <table><tr><td></td><td><i>ISSUE(S)</i></td><td><i>FINDING(S)</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>Hearing #1</i></td><td>Other</td><td>Pending</td></tr></table>		<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>FINDING(S)</i>	<i>Hearing #1</i>	Other	Pending			
	<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>FINDING(S)</i>									
<i>Hearing #1</i>	Other	Pending									

3. IDEA TRANSITION

Indicator		Findings	Documentation	Support Plan	Follow-up Findings
Compliance	1	<p>Early Intervention to Preschool Special Education (Part C to Part B Transition: Indicator #12)</p> <p>A school psychologist serves as the preschool coordinator and manages the transitions of children from Part C Early Intervention (EI) to preschool special education. Eligibility and placement decisions are made at a centralized Evaluation Team meeting. Participants do not include either a general early childhood teacher or an early childhood special education teacher. (RI Regulations 300.124 (c)).</p> <p>A database of all EI referrals is maintained, and upcoming birthdates are monitored to ensure that meetings are scheduled in a timely manner. The district achieved 86% compliance and that children referred from Early Intervention and found eligible for preschool special education had IEPs developed and implemented by their 3rd birthday.</p>	Data Analysis Interviews State Performance Plan	<p>The special education director will review roles and responsibilities with appropriate staff to ensure compliance Professional development/technical assistance in the cited area. In addition, the special education director will review and reassess the need for continued professional development / technical assistance in this area on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. December 2012 (Progress check July 2012).</p>	
Result/ Compliance	2	<p>IDEA Transition Planning at the Middle Level</p> <p>Currently at Birchwood Middle School students who are 14 years of age with IEPs do not engage in interest inventories and/or vocational assessments to inform their IEPs. Special educators discuss ideas and questions pertinent to the IEP to address specific required components (JK 4) (student census notes seven students as 14 years of age) (RI Regulations 300.320(b)(i))</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation JK4	<p>The special education director will review roles and responsibilities with appropriate staff to ensure compliance (Note, all cases of students with IEPs ages 14 and older at the middle school will be</p>	

				<p>reviewed and reconvened as appropriate to ensure current compliance). Professional development/technical assistance in the cited. In addition, the special education director will review and reassess the need for continued professional development / technical assistance in this area on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. December 2012 (Progress check July 2012).</p>	
Result	3	<p>Drop Out /Graduation Rate (State Performance Plan Indicators #1 and #2)</p> <p>The North Providence school district graduation rate is 79.60% for all students and 56.40% for students with disabilities. These rates are higher than the state average rates of 75.80% for all students and lower than the state average of 57.20% for students with disabilities.</p> <p>The North Providence school district dropout rate is 15.80% for all students and 34.50% for students with disabilities. These rates are higher than the state average rates of 14.10% for all students and 23.60% for students with disabilities.</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation		
Result/ Compliance	4	<p>IDEA Transition Planning at the High School Level</p> <p>Case managers are responsible for completing the vocational assessment and WaytogoRI is most commonly used. Guidance counselors do personal education programs (PEP) and individual learning plans for each student. Staff understanding of the vocational assessment requirement varies. No vocational assessments were seen in the student's records and of five, three were produced at the school. Further, on the students IEPs what was listed as transition assessments (project focus</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation	The special education director will review roles and responsibilities with appropriate staff to ensure compliance (Note, all cited cases will be reviewed and reconvened as	

		presentation, project focus interview, individual learning plan, personal education plan, student/teacher interviews) are not formalized transition assessments. (RI Regulations 300.320(b)(i))		appropriate to ensure current compliance). Professional development/technical assistance in the cited. In addition, the special education director will review and reassess the need for continued professional development / technical assistance in this area on an ongoing basis. Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. December 2012 (Progress check July 2012).	
Result	5	At the high school the case manager or department chair is the point for the Office of Rehabilitative Services (ORS) referrals at the school and the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD). Students interviewed (SW2 a senior, SW3 a junior) were unaware of ORS or the services they could receive from such an agency.	Interviews Document Review		
Result	6	Summary of Performance (SOP) is facilitated by the case manager as appropriate.	Interviews Document Review		
Result	7	Youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, and transition services. (State Performance Plan Indicator #13) . North Providence was 100% compliant for this indicator.	Interviews Document Review		
Result	8	Eighty-eight and a half percent (88.5%) of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and who have been employed, enrolled in postsecondary school, or both within 1 year of leaving high school. (State Performance Plan Indicator #14)	Interviews Document Review		